



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/580,648	05/30/2000	Asif Dawoodi Gandhi	2925-0380P	1505

30594 7590 07/10/2002

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. BOX 8910  
RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER

MILLER, BRANDON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

DATE MAILED: 07/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*Me*

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/580,648

Applicant(s)

GANDHI ET AL.

Examiner

Brandon J Miller

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 21-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 May 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over H'mimy in view of Peterson.

Regarding claim 1 H'mimy teaches controlling access of a subscriber station to a wireless communications system (see col. 1, lines 43-46 & 66-67). H'mimy also teaches a first and second performance indicator for a reverse link associated with a subscriber (see col. 1, lines 66-67 and col. 2, lines 30-36) and establishing a blocking threshold value (see col. 2, lines 45-49). H'mimy does not teach deciding whether to grant or deny access to a subscriber station seeking access to a wireless communications system based on the comparison of a first performance indicator to a blocking threshold value. Peterson teaches deciding whether to grant or deny access to a subscriber station seeking access to a communications system based on a comparison of codes (see col. 17, lines 50-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the H'mimy adapt to include deciding whether to grant or deny access to a subscriber station seeking access to a wireless communications system based on the comparison of a first performance indicator to a blocking threshold value because this would allow a wireless communication system to maintain a specific level of performance.

Regarding claim 2 Peterson teaches restricting access to a subscriber station (see col. 17, lines 50-53) and H'mimy teaches a performance indicator that exceeds a threshold (see col. 8, lines 36-37) and a blocking threshold (see col. 2, lines 45-49).

Regarding claim 3 Peterson teaches granting access to a subscriber station (see col. 17, lines 50-53) and H'mimy teaches a performance indicator that is less than or equal to a blocking threshold (see col. 2, lines 44-46).

Regarding claim 6 H'mimy and Peterson teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for a blocking threshold range defined by a maximum blocking threshold, and a minimum blocking threshold, which are determined based on estimated variation in the reverse frame error rate associated with a subscriber station. H'mimy teaches establishing a minimum blocking threshold and a maximum threshold (see col. 3, lines 11-14 & 20-23). H'mimy also teaches a variation in bit error rate (see col. 5, lines 24-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the H'mimy and Peterson adapt to include a blocking threshold range defined by a maximum blocking threshold, and a minimum blocking threshold, which are determined based on estimated variation in the reverse frame error rate associated with the subscriber station because this would allow a wireless communication system to operate within a specific performance range.

Regarding claim 13 H'mimy and Peterson teach a device as recited in claim 2 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 14 H'mimy and Peterson teach a device as recited in claim 3 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Claims 4-5, 7-12, 15-18 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over H'mimy in view of Peterson and Egner.

Regarding claim 4 H'mimy and Peterson teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for obtaining an interference rise over a thermal noise floor as a first performance indicator and loading as a second performance indicator with the interference rise over a thermal noise floor being a ratio of total reverse link power received by a base station to thermal noise power in a receive band and loading indicating how much each subscriber station contributes to interference. H'mimy teaches reverse link channel assignment associated with a subscriber station (see col. 2, lines 30-34), and a first and second performance indicator (see col. 1, lines 66-67 and col. 2, lines 30-35). Egner teaches a rise in system interference (see col. 2, lines 1-2), background noise (see col. 7, lines 41-43), and loading across a wireless communications system (see col. 1, lines 54-57). Egner also teaches signal power received by a base station (see col. 6, lines 59-63) and loading that indicates interference (see col. 2, lines 25-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the H'mimy and Peterson adapt to include obtaining an interference rise over a thermal noise floor as a first performance indicator and loading as a second performance indicator with the interference rise over a thermal noise floor being a ratio of total reverse link power received by a base station to thermal noise power in a receive band and loading indicating how much each subscriber station contributes to interference because this would allow a wireless communication system maintain a specific level of performance based on specific performance indicators.

Regarding claim 5 H'mimy, Peterson, and Egner teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for obtaining a reverse link frame error rate and dropped call rate to modify a value of a

Art Unit: 2683

blocking threshold. H'mimy teaches reverse link channel assignment (see col. 2, lines 30-34), a blocking threshold (see col. 2, lines 45-49) and obtaining a bit error rate (see col. 5, lines 24-26). Edgar teaches a dropped call rate (see col. 10, lines 23-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the H'mimy, Peterson, and Egner adapt to include obtaining a reverse link frame error rate and dropped call rate to modify a value of a blocking threshold because this would allow for adjustable access control in a wireless communications system

Regarding claim 7 Egner teaches a loading estimate that includes interference contributions from subscriber stations in a subject cell and interference contributions from subscriber stations in other surrounding cells (see abstract).

Regarding claim 8 H'mimy teaches dynamically adjusting a blocking threshold value (see col. 6, lines 30-33). Egner teaches a loading estimate of a base station and a performance of active subscriber stations using resources of a base station (see col. 1, lines 57-65).

Regarding claim 9 H'mimy, Peterson, and Egner teach a device as recited in claim 5 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 10 H'mimy, Peterson, and Egner teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for relaxing a blocking threshold to allow more subscriber stations to access a wireless communication system if a reverse link frame error rate and a dropped call rate indicate an acceptable level of performance. H'mimy teaches reverse link channel assignment (see col. 2, lines 31-34), a blocking threshold (see col. 2, lines 45-49) and obtaining a bit error rate (see col. 5, lines 24-26). Peterson teaches allowing continued subscriber station access to a communication system (see col. 10, lines 13-15). Edgar teaches a dropped call rate (see col. 10,

Art Unit: 2683

lines 23-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the H'mimy, Peterson, and Egner adapt to include relaxing a blocking threshold to allow more subscriber stations to access a wireless communication system if a reverse link frame error rate and a dropped call rate indicate an acceptable level of performance because this would allow for adjustable access control in a wireless communication system.

Regarding claim 11 H'mimy teaches refining an adjustment of a blocking threshold value with reference to a performance parameter (see col. 6, lines 30-33). Egner teaches a rise in interference (see col. 2, lines 1-2) and loading across a wireless communications system (see col. 1, lines 55-57).

Regarding claim 12 H'mimy teaches controlling access of a subscriber station to a wireless communications system (see col. 1, lines 43-46 and 66-67) and determining a blocking threshold (see col. 6, lines 30-33). H'mimy does not teach establishing a relationship of blocking threshold values to loading levels on a coverage area of a base station, measuring an actual loading level on a base station associated with a subscriber station seeking access to a wireless communication system, determining a corresponding blocking threshold value based on an actual measured loading level with reference to an established relationship, measuring an interference rise for a reverse channel of a subscriber station, or deciding whether to grant or deny access to a subscriber station seeking access to a wireless communications system based on the comparison of a first performance indicator to a blocking threshold value. Egner teaches loading levels on a coverage area of a base station, measuring actual loading levels on a base station associated with a subscriber station seeking access to a wireless communication system, and measuring an

Art Unit: 2683

interference rise (see col. 2, lines 1-2 & 30-39). Peterson teaches deciding whether to grant or deny access to a subscriber station seeking access to a communications system based on a comparison of codes (see col. 17, lines 50-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the H'mimy adapt to include establishing a relationship of blocking threshold values to loading levels on a coverage area of a base station, measuring an actual loading level on a base station associated with a subscriber station seeking access to a wireless communication system, determining a corresponding blocking threshold value based on an actual measured loading level with reference to an established relationship, measuring an interference rise for a reverse channel of a subscriber station, and deciding whether to grant or deny access to a subscriber station seeking access to a wireless communications system based on the comparison of a first performance indicator to a blocking threshold value because this would allow a wireless communication system to maintain a specific level of performance.

Regarding claim 15 H'mimy, Paterson, and Egner teach a device as recited in claim 4 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 16 H'mimy and Peterson teach a device as recited in claim 5 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 17 H'mimy, Peterson, and Egner teach a device as recited in claim 12 except for measuring a reverse frame error rate of a reverse channel and a dropped call rate at a base station through which a subscriber station seeks access, or temporarily increasing a previous value for use in a deciding step if a measured reverse frame error rate is less than a nominal reverse frame error rate by more than a specified amount and if a measured dropped call rate is



Art Unit: 2683

less than a nominal dropped call value by more than a specified amount. H'mimy teaches a bit error rate (see col. 5, lines 24-26) and revising a blocking threshold value (see col. 6, lines 30-32). H'mimy also teaches changing a previous value for use in a deciding step (see col. 6, lines 10-20). Egner teaches a dropped call rate at a base station through which a subscriber station seeks access to wireless communications system (see col. 2, lines 30-34 and FIG. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the H'mimy, Peterson, and Egner adapt to include measuring a reverse frame error rate of a reverse channel and a dropped call rate at a base station through which a subscriber station seeks access, and temporarily increasing a previous value for use in a deciding step if a measured reverse frame error rate is less than a nominal reverse frame error rate by more than a specified amount and if a measured dropped call rate is less than a nominal dropped call value by more than a specified amount because this would allow adjustable access control in a wireless communication system.

Regarding claim 18 H'mimy, Peterson, and Egner teach a device as recited in claim 12 except for measuring a reverse frame error rate of a reverse channel and a dropped call rate at a base station through which a subscriber station seeks access, or temporarily decreasing a previous value for use in a deciding step if a measured reverse frame error rate is greater than a nominal reverse frame error rate by more than a specified amount and if a measured dropped call rate is greater than a nominal dropped call value by more than a specified amount. H'mimy teaches a bit error rate (see col. 5, lines 24-26) and revising a blocking threshold value (see col. 6, lines 30-32). H'mimy also teaches changing a previous value for use in a deciding step (see col. 6, lines 10-20). Egner teaches a dropped call rate at a base station through which a

Art Unit: 2683

subscriber station seeks access to wireless communications system (see col. 2, lines 30-34 and FIG. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the H'mimy, Peterson, and Egner adapt to include measuring a reverse frame error rate of a reverse channel and a dropped call rate at a base station through which a subscriber station seeks access, and temporarily decreasing a previous value for use in a deciding step if a measured reverse frame error rate is greater than a nominal reverse frame error rate by more than a specified amount and if a measured dropped call rate is greater than a nominal dropped call value by more than a specified amount because this would allow adjustable access control in a wireless communication system.

Regarding claim 21 H'mimy teaches controlling access of a subscriber station to a wireless communications system (see col. 1, lines 43-46 and 66-67) and determining a blocking threshold (see col. 6, lines 30-33). H'mimy also teaches a first and second performance indicator for a reverse link associated with a subscriber (see col. 1, lines 66-67 and col. 2, lines 30-35). H'mimy does not teach a load level detector for detecting a load level on a base station, a database for storing a desired signal performance parameter value and a loading level or a blocking manager deciding whether to grant or deny access to a subscriber station seeking access to a wireless communications system based on the comparison of a first performance indicator to a blocking threshold. Egner teaches a load level detector for detecting a load level on a base station and a database for storing signals (see col. 2, lines 30-39 and col. 12, lines 20-24). Peterson teaches deciding whether to grant or deny access to a subscriber station seeking access to a communications system based on a comparison of codes (see col. 17, lines 50-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make

Art Unit: 2683

the H'mimy adapt to include a load level detector for detecting a load level on a base station, a database for storing a desired signal performance parameter value and a loading level and a blocking manager deciding whether to grant or deny access to a subscriber station seeking access to a wireless communications system based on the comparison of a first performance indicator to a blocking threshold because this would allow a wireless communication system to maintain a certain level of performance.

Regarding claim 22 Egner teaches an interference rise level (see col. 2, lines 1-2) and Peterson teaches granting access of a subscriber station to a wireless communications system (see col. 17, lines 50-53).

Regarding claim 23 Egner teaches a loading level that represents a ratio of active channels of a base station to available channels of a base station (see abstract).

### ***Claim Objections***

The claims 19-20 are objected to because they include reference characters which are not enclosed within parentheses.

Reference characters corresponding to elements recited in the detailed description of the drawings and used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims. See MPEP § 608.01(m).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2683

Talarmo U.S Patent No. 5,790,938 discloses a method for controlling a subscriber station in a mobile radio system.

Thompson U.S Patent No. 6,122,516 discloses allocating channels for a wireless link between a central terminal and a subscriber terminal of a wireless telecommunications system.

Bhatia U.S Patent No. 6,112,101 discloses load based priority for a mobile subscriber.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J Miller whose telephone number is 703-305-4222. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

\*\*\*

June 24, 2002



WILLIAM TROST  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600